THE WORKERS'
DREADNOUGHT
For International Socialism.

Vol. V.—No. 35 SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 23rd, 1918 Price Twopence.

THE LABOUR PARTY CONFERENCE.

The Labour Party has decided to bring its representatives out of the Coalition Government at the close of the present Parliament. It has passed a resolution demanding the release of John Maclean, a resolution forced on it by the rebel rank and file. These were the only two decisions registered at the Conference in the Central Hall, Westminster, on November 14th.

These decisions mark an advance. But the Conference has once more failed to act as the occasion demanded. It has failed to realise and to proclaim by word and deed its solidarity with the Revolution of the workers in Germany, Austria, Bulgaria, Russia, and in the other countries to which it is spreading. Robert Smillie told the Conference that the French Socialists and Trade Unionists had met in Conference and had passed a resolution congratulating the German workers on the establishment of their republic. He said: "This Conference has not the courage to follow that example," and only a few vague voices answered: "Why not?" Smillie himself failed to make an insistent demand that it should be done. Resolutions of congratulation mean very little, but even that mild token of solidarity was withheld. How amazing indeed are the Socialists who do not know and welcome the long-desired Socialism when it appears!

Only two of the speeches displayed an independent fighting spirit, a spirit in keeping with the fact that the world is at last entering upon the great period of its history in which Labour will triumph over Capitalism. One of these speeches was not delivered from the floor of the Conference, but came as an interruption from the gallery and an attempt was made to put out the man who made it. It was W. F. Watson calling to the delegates: "You are going to take a vote as to whether Clynes shall stay in the Government, but what about John Maclean, who is going to die in prison?" The other note of independence was struck by Gallagher from the Clyde, who openly declared his desire for revolution.

Something has happened to the Labour Party Conference, a discordant critical spirit has entered there. The atmosphere of leader-worship has vanished. "Patriotism," in the sense of subservience to the Government, is at a discount. Henderson, who was the hero of the hour when he left the Cabinet, who was listened to as the principal leader, the man who knew, and was cheered on every appearance, has now fallen to the position of a mere nobody in the Conference. He made no speech last Thursday, and contented himself with reading out brief business announcements on the result of the voting and such formal matters. The interviews which he has been giving to the Press of late have lost him the remnants of his popularity. Curiously enough, the only people who spoke of victory and its fruits were some of the pacifists, who, not realising the magnitude of the change that has taken place in the Labour Movement, again and again made use of jingo catch-phrases in order to placate the prejudices of their war-time opponents.

Robert Williams, in moving, on behalf of the Executive, the resolution to withdraw from the Coalition, adopted a tone of unwonted meekness. The Executive, he said, had done its best to maintain an honourable agreement with the Labour members of the Government, and he expressed his own desire to continue working with them on amicable terms. There were some Labour members of the Government he personally thought would be better out of the movement; others, he said, "I respect, like my good friend Clynes." He wanted to see a *rapprochement* between the Labour members of the Government and the members of the Shop Stewards' Rank and File Movement. (Mr. Williams should read the parable which warns men not to put new wine into old bottles!) He wanted an Independent Party on the floor of the House of Commons to secure the Party's programme outlined in the pamphlet called 'The New Social Order.' We wonder that such a revolutionary firebrand as Mr. Williams sometimes seems to be in his speeches, should trouble about that mild and wishywashy palliative programme. If the workers could not secure the reforms set out in that pamphlet, he thought they would resort to insurrection. Was Mr. Williams implying that that would be regrettable? He did not say so, but that seemed to be the logical inference from his words: a seat upon the Executive is apt to breed a sense of caution.

Ammon (Postal Group), who seconded the resolution, has also grown of late somewhat careful. He is a Parliamentary candidate, and that too has a steadying influence. "Some of us in a few days are to meet our constituents." No, no, Mr. Ammon, *your* would-be constituents—there is a world of difference there. If candidates could only be sure of the votes how very much bolder their words would be! Ammon declared that "the work for which the Labour Party entered the Coalition is accomplished, since the autocrats of Germany have fallen." But, Mr. Ammon, we thought that you were against both the Coalition and the War! He added a saving clause. The fall of the autocrats was due as much to the German Revolution as to the force of the Allied arms. "Having won victory on the battlefield; having overthrown Prussianism...."—he was at it again. How these candidates interlard their speeches with catch phrases!

Ammon also appealed to Clynes to come out of the Coalition. Then Clynes rose to speak and was received with some applause—not with much enthusiasm, it is true, but still with applause that would have been denied to Barnes, Roberts, or Hodge. "We might get someone worse at the Food Ministry," is the thought that tempers the wind of criticism where Clynes is concerned.

The majority of the Labour members of Parliament are opposed to coming out of the Coalition before the election. The Parliamentary Party had tabled an amendment that: "The Coalition Government should be supported till the end of the War and on peace being signed the Party should resume its freedom of action." The speeches of those who supported the amendment clearly showed that in their view "freedom of action" by no means necessarily meant that the Party should withdraw its members at any period. Indeed, the main burden of their argument was that it is better to be in any coalition at any time than to be left outside.

Clynes moved the amendment. He said that it was his own and represented a middle course which he had chosen between two extremes. He appeared to be playing an independent hand, looking to his own position and not troubling about the fortunes of any Party. Knowing that the amendment would be defeated, he delivered a lateral attack upon the Party, saying the sort of things the capitalist papers were fairly certain to report against it. He accused it of whining about the election being taken at this juncture, though, he asserted, it had been the first of the Parties since the War, to begin an independent political campaign, and he twitted his colleagues in the Party for their unwillingness to appeal to the people for a new mandate after eight years. *He* was assured of the support of his constituents and of the support of his organisation; without this support *he* would not be willing to retain his place in the Government. When Clynes first entered Parliament, as an I.L.P. representative, he did pledge himself not to mere obedience to the voice of the majority, but to work for Socialism. Nevertheless, his words held a sting; there is always something contemptible in the position of those who cling to office. That is one of the great reasons why it is best that men and women should be the directly elected and instructed delegates of those they profess to serve. Continuing his attack on those who desired to withdraw from the Coalition Government, Clynes said that he had watched, "with a good deal of lamentation at times," the actions of the I.L.P. members of the Party Executive. The Prime Minister in France had told the American troops that the German people could have peace on the terms of President Wilson's fourteen points. He was interrupted by cries of "The Kaiser," and he cruelly replied: "The Kaiser symbolised the purpose of the German people at that time." It was most important, he said, that the Labour Party should have passed a resolution welcoming the declaration of the Prime Minister and that that resolution should have been sent to the German people. If that had been done he thought it might have brought the War to an end sooner, but the I.L.P. men would not agree. Curious statement, this, from one of the men who have opposed holding any converse with the German Socialists during the War! He, Clynes, was opposed to the mere drafting of resolutions; he wanted the Party to *do* something. Someone called: "What is the programme?" He tamely replied that, of course, the D.O.R.A. must be abolished, but he continued, "free speech is exactly what I claim the working masses have enjoyed during this War." Voice yelled: "John Maclean," "Wallhead," and other prisoners' names at him, but he went on: "So far as there has been interference with free speech, it has been on the part of working men themselves." Was there ever before such a bold-faced apologist for any government?

He sneered at Robert Williams for his sudden conversion to the cause of order and restraint; only last week at the Albert Hall Williams had called for the establishment of a Socialist Republic and "a notice 'To Let' at Buckingham Palace." "Is that restraint?" Clynes asked sanctimoniously, but there were no cheers, only some angry interruptions, and one heard the murmur: "Capitalist scab!" Robert Williams had appealed to Clynes and his colleagues in the Government for loyal support of the Conference's decisions: when had he himself loyally supported them? How had he treated its decisions on the War and the Coalition? Clynes spoke now with a note of bitterness; he was feeling the turning of the tide, knowing defeat. But he would not let the case go by default; he was making a fight for it. He appealed to the pride of the delegates: the War would end with the Peace Con-

Continued on page 1128

ORIGINAL DEFECTIVE.

BOLSHEVIK IDEALS AND THEIR FAILURE.

(*Reprinted with omissions from an article by Dr.* C. HAGBERG WRIGHT *in 'The Contemporary Review,' November*, 1918.)

Revolutionary Russia thinks that England is as Imperialistic as Germany, and therefore equally a foe of its Revolution. We shall not so much as begin to understand the Russian problem until we recognise quite frankly that England—like the rest of the world outside Russia—does stand for conceptions and methods in politics and industry which Revolutionary Russia rejects utterly.

The Bolsheviks are very much out of favour just now. Our writers and talkers have emptied upon them a poor vocabulary of abuse, and, hoping to drive suburban pieties into the incredulous hearts of refractory "Labour," have made of them a sort of "bogey-man". But it must be borne in mind: **The Russian problem, the real Russian problem, is constituted, not by the violence of the Bolsheviks, but by the constructive thought for which they stand.** We must get rid, once and for all, of the misleading notion that the Bolshevik leaders are mere scum thrown up by a vicious ferment. Happily, close to my hand there is an authority....On January 9th last Mr. Hamilton Fyfe wrote:—

"To begin with, we must not—as most people here still do, I fancy—think of men like Lenin, Trotsky and Chicherin as men of no account, mere mob-leaders, hooligans; Lenin is a student, thinker, writer.

"Lenin now has for many years been director of the Bolshevik Party, chiefly in exile. A man of highly cultivated mind but deliberately careless in dress and personal appearance. Prefers to look like a peasant or a town labourer. An honest idealist"

There lies before me also a Russian pamphlet written by Lenin before he became the head of a Russian Government:—

"Our duty, therefore, if we wish to remain Socialists, is to go lower and deeper to the real masses. Therein was the whole meaning of the struggle with opportunism and of this struggle. To explain to the masses the necessity and the inevitableness of a break with opportunism, to urge them to an inspiring struggle with it, to teach them all the evil of National, liberal and labour politics, that is the only Marxian line of advance for the workers' world-movement."

The writer had already envisaged "the dictatorship of the Proletariat." From the same pamphlet I translate a few other sentences:—

Social Democracy does not aim only at the abolition of the division of humanity into small governments and of all particularising of nations, and not only at the coming together of nations—it aims at the fusion of nations."

A new general order of things, based upon a world-wide integration, moral if not institutional, of the workers—that is what Lenin is thinking of, or dreaming of....Lenin is not merely an iconoclast. He has a constructive thought; beyond the destruction he intends he sees a new polity, a new civilisation. The new civilisation would be one based upon a new order in industry: the new polity would be one based upon the workers, upon those who are now, but then would not be, the proletariat. And neither the civilisation nor the polity would be national. Each would be the local and non-particularising realisation of a thought wholly general.

The Soviet Republic intends such a polity and such a civilisation. The word "Soviet" means Council. It has become familiar in England as the designation of those Councils of Workers' and Soldiers' delegates which were established everywhere in Russia immediately after the fall of Tsardom. In the Constitution decreed on July 10th last the Russian State appears as "a Republic of Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies," and is referred to under the novel designation "Russian Socialist Federative Republic."

"The present day Russian Soviet Government," said Mr. Louis Edgar Browne,* is really only the Executive Committee of a vast number of local village, town and city Soviets in which there exists a real sound democratic idea of majority rule"....

The Russian Revolution, now occupying the centre of the quaking world's stage, allows the careful observer to catch a glimpse of what that entity people really must be. The Russian people, struggling to assert itself, has in the travail of the Revolution given birth to a new creation, flexible, mobile, and yet persistent as are the thoughts and will it expresses. This creation is the Soviet. The trumpets of the March Revolution, 1917, brought down the Romanov dynasty, and the rejoicing of the Russian people knew no bounds. But the events immediately following had a sobering effect upon the masses. The first burning question arose: "Is the Revolution safe?" As the embodied answer to this question, sprang up the Soviet, a revolutionary creation, a child of the people's awakening consciousness. City, town and village, as well as each unit of the army, all formed their local Soviets to safeguard the Revolution.

These local organs, always functioning and therefore always reflecting the thoughts, desires, and will of the small communities they represent, send delegates to the capital, who form the Central Executive Committee of all the Soviets of Workmen's, Soldiers', and Peasants' Delegates. The election to the central body is carried out on the basis of party lines, so that the Central Executive Committee has always represented all the various currents and even undercurrents of the Russian Revolution.

Soon after the overthrow of Tsardom, the people felt that the newly-formed Provisional Government of Lvov-Rodzianko-Milyukov did not intend to deviate from the general policies of the old régime. This popular feeling imparted itself to the local Soviets, which resulted in the second question: "Who is friend and who is foe?" In other words, the Soviet was forced to explain the sense of the Revolution. The first answer was a fermentation within the Soviets, reflecting the people's questioning mind, and this fermentation ended in the cleavage of the Soviet forces. Materially the split manifested itself in the first "coalition government," headed by Kerensky.

This second question was made more vital and insistent by the Korniloff uprising. It grew more and more obvious to the people that the "coalition government" was merely an expression of the old order under a new name. In response to the growing popular unrest, the rift in the Soviet deepened; whatever elements irresistibly tended to the right were pushed out by popular pressure upon the left, and the result was the July insurrection. The Soviet thus emphasised the popular interpretation of the sense of the Revolution. It is not merely a political revolution, but an economico-social revolution, and whoever thwarts its course is the people's enemy.

But if indeed this is the historical sense of the Revolution, then arises a third question: By whom and how shall the issues of the Revolution be promoted and realised in life? Of course by the people, and by the power which expresses the people, by the Soviets. Such was the categorical answer given by the November uprising, which for ever put an end to the policy of coalition and alliances of the real Revolution with the representatives of the dying old order. Thus by a process of elimination the Soviet was finally purified of the elements leaning toward the right; a process which showed that, as the individual hesitates before making his choice and stamping as his will one or the other of the ideas conflicting in his mind, so the Russian people hesitated before it found and expressed its conscious will. The Soviet made this possible.

In brief, these are the three phases passed through by the Soviet from birth to manhood: (1) It issued from the very heart of the people as guardian of the Revolution; (2) while growing, it served as the pendulum, the interpreter of the Revolution; (3) fully matured as the volitional and intellectual organ of its parent, the people, it became the instrument for realising the issues of the Revolution....

What should one say to all this? One thing seems quite clear—the Bolshevik Revolution was not merely the victory of a destructive force; it was also the victory of a constructive idea. Think of that idea what you will, it is a milestone in human history, and for many a long day and in every part of the world millions will see in it a signpost. Even if it be fallacious, it is a no worse case than some of the thoughts that have achieved, and to-day enjoy, much political credit, in circles quite respectable. I am no Social Democrat, yet it seems to me that, under the Soviet Government, the Russian Revolution became a reasoned experiment towards Freedom—novel (it is true) in method and aim, but profoundly interesting and not without hopeful possibilities. Unfortunately, the Soviet Government has never had fair play. Had it been recognised by the Allied Powers, and we had accredited to it a first-rate mind, there would have been no need for it to call in the sanguinary safeguard of the Red Terror.

Why did not England recognise the Soviet Government? A people that celebrates France's Day, glorifies Cromwell, and is proud of 1688 cannot object to a Revolution merely because it *is* a Revolution. And as a matter of fact, we did *not* object to the Russian Revolution. In England as in Russia, the Tsardom was "unwept, unhonoured": in England as in Russia, we praised the Russian Revolution, and even when a continuing Revolution made Kerensky a Minister—"Kerensky the Red" as he called himself—our plaudits did not cease. Indeed, we paid Kerensky a compliment which we then thought the highest compliment in our power—we called him "the Lloyd George of Russia." Thus far we were cordial, but when the destructive character of the Russian Revolution became clear our thoughts rebounded to that palladium of the comfortable, law and order, and we withheld recognition.

Shallow reasons have been put forward in justification of our Government's attitude. It has been said, for instance, that the Soviet Government represented only a section of the Russian people, and came into being by a violent usurpation. No doubt the Soviet Government did represent only a section of the Russian people, but an American on the spot writes: "The Bolsheviks were extreme Socialists. They perfected the organisation of a central clearing house for these thousands of Soviets. They used this organisation to spread their propaganda, and won over to their point of view 95 per cent of the soldiers and 80 per cent of the peasant masses." Ninety-five per cent of the soldiers, 80 per cent of the peasants, these are larger percentages than would have voted in France for the restoration of the Bourbons after Napoleon's first downfall. I cannot, however, bring myself to spend time over percentages. England did not refuse to recognise the Soviet Government solely because the Government was "sectional," she refused also because strong forces in England—commercial, industrial, agrarian, political—felt a kinship to things in Russia which the Soviet Government did not represent, and disliked very much indeed that which it did quite effectively represent.

This brings me to the second objection—the Soviet Government "came into being by a violent usurpation." I am inclined to ask, "What if it did?" But that would miss the real point. The real point should be sought in the noun rather than in the adjective—in "usurpation" rather than in "violent." Dominant powers in England dislike the Soviet Revolution because, in the Revolution, the "People" acted for themselves; they dislike the spontaneity of Freedom. A regulated

Continued at foot of next page.

* Correspondent in Russia of the Chicago Daily News.

BETWEEN OURSELVES. By L. A. Motler.

THE UNABASHED BOLSHEVIK.

There is a gentleman—I should say a noble Lord—whose name doth rhyme with Pecksniff. What there is particular about this scion of our ancient nobility is that he owns two papers of grave national import. One is *The Times*: the other is *Comic Cuts*. What there is further is that His Ludship occasionally, at some banquet of grave and reverend profiteers, gives forth utterance to the *national* war aims and the *national* views on various subjects, from French Yellow Books to Russian Red Bolsheviks. The latter are especially a toothsome morsel to wash down with walnuts and champagne (uncontrolled—in more senses than one).

A gentle pirate, by the name of Lenin, and a black-bearded brigand, answering to the name of Trotsky, are the noble Lord's pets. He is so fond of them that he will print anything about them: any old kind of document will do, so it has their names in it. The most recent are some photographs of letters captured by the American Secret Service; I say captured, since all is fair in love and war—and hate. We will not inquire too closely how the documents came into the hands of parties not immediately interested in them. Suffice it to say that they prove once more—this will make the 567th time, I think—that Messrs. Pirate and Brigand are in Germhun pay and that the public are warned not to have anything to do with such abandoned profligates. Fortunately, the public is not likely to travel to Russia, or if it desires so to do, Mr. Havelock Wilson, O.B.E., and his friend Capt. Tupper will know the reason why!

Time was when the impeccable *Times* printed correspondence supplied by a modestly anonymous Russian patriot in Paris, to the same effect, but it was very regrettable that he became mislaid when his credentials were sought after by unnecessarily inquisitive persons—to wit, Socialists. They wanted to know, you know.

There was also a slight misconception when it was stated that the Tyrant—Lenin, to be precise—and his dastardly accomplice, Trotsky (let us be assured of our facts by naming names), had fled into the bosoms of their friends of the German General Staff, with more wealth than there was reputed to be in Russia. But one more lie—tut, tut, misconception—is just one more, that's all. What is evident, however, is that Lenin and Trotsky are decidedly undesirable people, who cannot be trusted to mind your grand piano whilst you go into the Ritz to have a look at to-day's menu.

The noble Lord hereinbefore referred to is evidently easily taken advantage of, for we find him printing the following:—

"Bolsheviks' War Chest. Reported flight of Army Chief with 10,000,000 roubles. Copenhagen Thursday. It is reported from Vienna &c."

It would appear that Russia is a highly desirable place to go to when you are unable to meet the increased rates which a patriotic landlord, unable to increase the rent, has forced you to pay—no doubt as a sacrifice on the altar of national economy. All one has to do is to button-hole at the right moment some member of the Government—I should say Soviet—who is prepared to take a trip to the Ballplatz with a few million roubles. Now it is evident that, as Messrs. Comrades Lenin and Trotsky have only taken about a total of fifty million roubles, not counting their secret account at the Deutscher Bank, which is known to everybody who reads My Lord's aberrations, there must be at least a few millions overlooked. Note that trainloads of specie have been sent to Germany in partial payment of indemnities. Also that the British are alleged to have captured other bullion, which they magnanimously intend to hand over to our gallant Allies the Czecho-Sovacs, who are more fortunate in their fight for freedom than the Irish.

There are also, in My Lord Pecksniff's megaphones, certain accounts about to be settled with an itinerant musician called Tchicherine, who (terrible thought) once lived a few doors from my modest two unfurnished. I am not certain that he is a musician, but he is at present Bolshevik Foreign Secretary, and that is enough to perish his soul in the hereafter. What he is guilty of is not clear, but that will not embarrass us. If there is anything "agin him" we will ferret it out and publish it in time to divert if need be public attention from an Allied dash to Moscow from the Black Sea.

As our brave and gallant cousins the Americans say, His Ludship's press is *some* press.

DORAFORM.

The papers of the Socialist movement are regrettably reckless in their assertions that this is a capitalists' war. It may be true, as the gallant patriot Blumenfeld said once in *The Express*, that these papers are only read by a few cranks who are of less importance than a Saturday afternoon "meeting" of about half a dozen policemen, one boy, and a mongrel with a tomato-can ornamenting its tail—as addressed by Mr. Stubbs, the unofficial M.P. of Woolwich Arsenal. But they make enough noise for a couple of Russian Revolutions. Now when a respectable trade paper like *The Engineer* (October 18th, 1918) says: "This is a war for iron," that is, of course, vastly different. There is no occasion to rush the printer and seal up his press and his premises. Much less is there need to fine the editor fifty of the best for "causing mutiny, sedition, &c."

Further it must be admitted that there is no case within the meaning of the act when *The Sunday Post* (September 22nd, 1918) rushes into print with the following facts:—

"North of Verdun are ore regions, the largest iron ore deposits in Europe.

"Thionville: centre of Lorraine iron mines, producing 22,000,000 tons a year.

"North of Nancy: immensely valuable potash mines.

"North of Mulhausen: potash mines estimated to contain about 300,000,000 tons of pure potash.

"North of Saarburg: oil district yielding 30,000 tons of mineral oil in a year.

"Saarbrucken: coal fields."

These are merely facts, and if some orange-box orator imagines it implies that we are fighting for anything other than freedom, honour, and a knock-out blow, he ought to be severely doraformed. Naturally, as *The Star* (November 6th, 1918) says, we must have the "fruits of victory." And if Dame Bellona thrusts iron ore in Lorraine and coal in the Saar Valley on us, as well as ivory and rubber in Central Africa, that is, as Shakespeare has it, a mere detail.

Honoured guests like the Hon. W. Hughes are quite at liberty to state that nary a shred of Australian wool will go to the Deutscher Fabriken when this war to end war has been put on the shelf—till the next time. It is quite a self-denying ordnance for our masters to refuse to make profit out of the atrocious but business-like Hun.

Doraform is specially useful in cases of pamphlets with such titles as 'The War of Steel and Gold.' What we have we hold, and the way we got it is not by the bayonet, as some misguided Little Englanders suppose. Our weapons are sometimes more deadly. They are whiskey and the Bible.

But Doraform is not the only medicament we have for deluded and deluding wreckers. The public must also be protected from their wiles: the price of beer, our "Labour" Food Controller assures us, will be lowered shortly. And maybe the quality will be bettered, if you can legitimately talk of bettering a beverage a blind cow would not touch with its tail. But anyway a public that can stand four years of Government ale can stand anything.

And most decidedly beer must be cheaper that a hilarious public may not scrutinise the peace terms too closely and ask precisely where *they* come in.

BOLSHEVIK IDEALS. **Continued from page 1126**

Freedom, a Freedom that will speak and act only through organisation which between them they can control, is a very fine thing, and the pillar of the English State.

The Soviet Revolution should rather be considered as the removal of an obstruction by the real authority. The first Russian Revolution, the Revolution which destroyed the Tsardom, was the work, not of the Moderate Parties in Russia, but of extreme Parties—of the very, forces that subsequently established the Soviet Republic. Those forces created the Soviets, and thereby gave to themselves an institutional form—the associated Soviets were the Revolution organised. Whatever was outside the Soviets was not the real Revolution.

Between the fall of the Tsardom and the fall of Kerensky, this is what happened in Russia. The organised Revolution found itself everywhere hampered and hindered. The first Ministers of New Russia, although part of the Revolution, were not *of* the Revolution. Bolsheviks called them reactionary, but this adjective has a meaning peculiar to Russia. From the point of view of the real Revolution, or let us say from Lenin's point of view, the best that could be said for the new Ministers was that they were opportunists whose opportunism was limited, not only by itself, but also by preferences characteristic of the Intelligentzia and *Bourgeoisie*. And these Ministers continued to use the old administrative machine. No wonder there was trouble in Russia.

Even the appointment of Ministers from the Left—Kerensky and his associates—did not improve matters much. The remedy, Lenin's remedy, was drastic but very simple, "all power to the Soviets." He saw that the Revolution could succeed only by becoming master in its own house, only by making the depositories of its authority the prime executors of its purpose. Now, the authority of the Russian Revolution resided, and (after the first moments) had always resided, in the associated Soviets—Lenin made the associated Soviets the Government of Revolutionary Russia. From Lenin's point of view this was not usurpation—and for that point of view there is much to be said.

The withholding of recognition tacitly encouraged all those heterogeneous elements in Russia that were adverse to the Soviet Republic. That was bad enough, but our political wisdom could not content itself with tacitly preparing civil war in Russia—it burst into speech. We were assured that England still had friends in Russia—the friends indicated were in the anti-Soviet camp. We were told not once, not twice, that Russia was disabled by delirium but, when brought to her proper mind, would again become belligerent. Where were the physicians from whom we were to expect the cure of Russia! They also were in the anti-Soviet camp. Not one word did we say, not one thing did we do, to win the confidence of the Russian people—the workmen, soldiers, and peasants. Thinking of our own interests in the War, not of the Russian people, we planned an expedition to the Murman Coast—to-day that expedition is co-operating (actually, if not formally) with every opposition force in Russia.

The leaders of the Bolsheviks felt that their position was being undermined. The moment came when they had to choose between flight and force. To save the Revolution they chose *force*, and in their hands force became the Terror....

The anti-Soviet camp was a diffused enmity—an enmity which lived in a mood and was communicated by a word. Moreover, the reaction against the Soviet Republic was not merely a reaction by individuals—it was a reaction by groups and classes which the Republic had not been able to assimilate. The prime energies of the reaction were nothing more nor less than a life become militant—the destructive life of those unassimilated groups and classes. The Bolsheviks chose force and used it radically. In other words, they set out to stop the reaction by rooting out the people whose life was its energy....

One word, however, on the accusation levelled at the Bolsheviks that they are "pro-German."

Concluded on p. 1130.

ORIGINAL DEFECTIVE.

THE WORKERS' DREADNOUGHT

EDITOR: SYLVIA PANKHURST.
Published by the Workers' Socialist Federation,
Telephone: EAST 1787.
Annual Subscription - Post Free, 10s. 10d.
Back Numbers, 4½d, post free.
MSS. should be addressed to the Editor at 400, Old Ford Road, London, E.3
All business communications to the MANAGER, 152, Fleet Street, London, E.C.4.

Vol. V., No. 35. Sat., November 23rd, 1918.

THE LABOUR PARTY CONFERENCE

(Continued from front page).

ference, in which Labour must take part, acting with the Prime Minister; the Temple of Peace could not be completed satisfactorily unless Labour had a hand in the work. But he did not know how men could presume to ask that Labour representatives should go to Versailles with Prime Ministers without having any contact with Governments. His tone seemed to imply, though he did not utter the words, "without paying the price." The Peace Conference would have an economic section: was the post to be filled by a Labour man or by a profiteer? He seemed to ask, though again the words were unsaid: "Am I to remain Food Minister?" Had he been told that his post depended on Labour remaining in the Coalition? If this resolution were passed, he urged that any working man who was taking part in constructive work on any Government Committee should be called off. Mr. Snowden was on the Liquor Control Board, "carrying out the policy of the Prime Minister: no doubt he thought he was doing useful work." Smillie was on the Coal Conciliation Board; hundreds of others were on such Boards, and he added: "They are paid in consequence of their good work."

But Clynes had a stronger card to play: he appealed to an argument that he knew was exercising the minds of scores of candidates: "If you decide to sever yourselves from the Government you will bring down upon them the resentment of the people who are ranged in support of the Government. If this is not so, why do you protest against the Election; why call it a dodge to do Labour out of its own? I am telling you how you will be labelled, how you will be rounded up. I am appealing to you not to commit the Party to this folly."

So he appealed to the old spirit of time-serving opportunism. At that moment there was a flash. The press had taken him at what was, perhaps, at once the apex and the lowest point of his career.

Will Thorne seconded the Clynes amendment. We are tempted to reproduce his speech literally as it was delivered, but, good-naturedly, we refrain; after all, we owe him some forebearance for so frankly letting us all see the methods of the Labour Party behind the scenes. He said: "I'm a-goin' to tell you the Labour Party never has been independent. There was only one man who was chairman of the Party who always refused to make bargains with the Government and that was Keir Hardie." (The Conference was awed for a moment by the mention of its founder, that stern and beautiful figure beside whom all these others were but paltry fellows.) "Wardle and MacDonald," Thorne continued, "was always a-makin' bargains with the Government, and sometimes behind the back of the decisions of the Party!" MacDonald half-rose, motioning towards him in protest, but the big, humorous, mocking voice, with its curious sound of rattling emphasis, had an answer ready: "Oh, yes, I know you never was chairman, but you was makin' bargains!"

Then there were cries for Thomas, and Thomas rushed up on to the platform (the well-known oratorical gladiators of the Conference always mount the platform, though the plain nobodies content themselves with trying to catch the attention of the delegates from wherever they chance to sit). Thomas, as usual, chose a safe course. He never says anything likely to bring down upon him the sort of denunciation by the capitalist press that endangers either votes or popularity. He said nothing of importance. A typical argument was that Asquith would be admitted to the Peace Conference whether he were in the Coalition or not and therefore Labour ought to be admitted on the same terms. What a pity these Labour members persist in trying to act as though they were capitalist politicians! It is a case of the world for the workers, but we only ask to be treated like Mr. Asquith. He uttered his usual warnings against Revolution.

After a humorous counter-revolutionary interlude by Sexton—a buffoon by nature—Bernard Shaw—a buffoon by profession—gave the Conference a display of his humour. If this was not the first time Bernard Shaw had appeared at a Labour Party Conference, at any rate it was the first time for many years. Assuming (though we cannot agree that it is so) that his is as the rapier thrust to a blow from the rolling-pin wrapped in dishcloths, as compared with the dialectics of common men, still this display was very old-fashioned. One realised that Shaw, in many respects the freshest, most daring thinker of his epoch, to-day is a back number, incapable of adjusting his mind to the new perspective, and is still obsessed by the silly old unrealities of the sham politics of twenty years ago. He assured the Conference that if it were going to be a political Party it must play the political game, and it was essential to democracy that there should be a Government and an opposition "to fight the thing out." To Mr. Shaw, leisurely reading his *Times* over his morning coffee and the proper vegetarian equivalent to eggs and bacon, the purpose of democracy is fulfilled if Lloyd George's budget has been denounced by Asquith and Henderson, and supported by Chamberlain and Bonar Law; but to Mrs. Jones at the washtub, or to John Brown at the bench, we wonder whether a hundred columns of Hansard matter at all. The speech of Mr. Clynes, Shaw told us, was the important business of the Conference; it was what we had all come to hear, for Shaw thought we had all expected that Mr. Clynes would tell us what Mr. Lloyd George had got to offer the Labour Party for remaining in the Coalition. But Mr. Clynes had come here "with his hands absolutely empty." The Tory Party had driven as hard a bargain with Lloyd George "as *we* are doing with the Germans." (Did Mr. Shaw intend to give his approval to the armistice terms by the use of that word "we"?) Lloyd George had promised the Unionists to go in for Imperial Preference; he had given into them concerning Ireland and had promised not to coerce Ulster; to the Welsh Churches he had promised more money. To Labour he had only promised "sympathetic consideration." "Do you want 'sympathetic consideration' or justice?" Shaw asked—a rather feeble question since there is no remote possibility of Labour obtaining justice from a capitalist Government. Shaw told us that the Labour Party was born when the Government had victimised Henderson and he had struck out and taken "his proper place as leader of the Labour Party." He added that Barnes had crossed the Rubicon and committed the unforgiveable sin against the sacred traditions of trade unionism when he took Henderson's job. It was all very stale. The Labour movement once stirred by these little happenings had forgotten them many months ago, before it was gripped by the Bolshevik Revolution, the great doings of which have grown upon it slowly. Shaw was raking in vain the dead embers; but in the end he raised a laugh: "Some of you may say: 'Oh, I'm as clever a man as Henderson,' but I am a cleverer man than Henderson [oh, Shaw, Shaw, when will that poor old joke grow stale to you?], and I ask you to send Mr. Clynes back with this message: 'Nothing doing.'" "Nothing doing"—that pleased the Conference, delegates took up the phrase, repeated it, and cheered it: the humourist had scored.

At last Gallagher seized the mood of the Conference—the mood that is growing impatient of the old political cant. He refused to join in the general eulogy of Clynes, who, when there was an outcry that the food supply should be owned and controlled by the people had gone into the Food Ministry and helped the Government to safeguard the profiteers. Clynes had asked the Party to remain in the Coalition, because "this thing had not been seen through"; but Labour was going to draw out because "this thing *had* been seen through!" The workers on the Continent were fighting for freedom; we here would help them, or play the part of scabs and help the capitalists. Between now and the signing of peace the capitalists would have tried to crush out the Workers' Revolution in Russia and the Central Empires. Thomas had spoken against the Bolsheviki; the Bolsheviki had put up a finer fight for freedom than the workers of any country. The rank and file on the Clyde would laugh at the Labour Party if it remained in the Coalition. He, Gallagher, was proud to call himself a Bolshevik; he must candidly say he was out for Revolution; it might come quietly through the ballot box, but a 6-inch howitzer gun was a fine thing.

Something was in the air now that was much more serious than the question of coming out of the Coalition. Cramp (N.U.R.) brought the delegates back to the point at issue, and gave the final blow to the Clynes amendment. Thorne had said that, whilst supporting the Coalition, he would support what candidates he chose. But Cramp disclosed the fact that Mr. Clynes when billed to speak for a Labour Party meeting had been obliged to cancel his engagement, because the meeting was in opposition to Sir Fortescue Stannery, the Coalition candidate. Only yesterday in another constituency, a letter had been received from Mr. Clynes saying that he could not come down to support the Labour candidate till he had ascertained the views of the Coalition upon the candidature. What more could be said? The Clynes amendment received 891,000 votes, and the resolution to leave the Coalition 2,117,000 out of a possible vote of 2,963,000.

Whilst the vote was being taken, W. F. Watson was ejected from the gallery for protesting on behalf of John Maclean, and during the proceedings Gallagher had privately warned the Arrangements Committee that unless a resolution demanding Maclean's release and that of all political prisoners and C.O.s were submitted to the Conference, a protest would be made at the Labour Party meeting at the Albert Hall that night. These things had their effect; and the resolution was allowed on condition that there were no speeches. It was unanimously carried.

The announcement that Ramsay MacDonald would move the resolution on the International was greeted with tremendous applause, during which cheers were given from the gallery for the Bolsheviki and the Revolution, and most heartily responded to alike by the visitors and the delegates. MacDonald always evokes much greater enthusiasm when he rises to speak than when his actual words are heard; we think because the attacks made on him by the capitalist press arouse the loyal solidarity of the socialist workers, their ardour being quickly damped down by his own temporising utterances. MacDonald is anything but a revolutionary; his outlook is steeped in the atmosphere of capitalist politics, and Socialism to him is a very far-away vision, only to be reached, if reached at all, by very cautious stages. He is bolder than Thomas, but, like Thomas, he has always an eye to what the capitalist press will make of his sayings. One would think that the capitalist press directs its attack against him, rather than other men, because it knows how much the attack displeases him; only it is so much more probable that the capitalist press deliberately makes a hero of MacDonald by smiting him, lest if it left him to sink into obscurity, the workers should choose heroes for themselves, and choose wild, revolutionary fellows like Gallagher and Maclean.

MacDonald moved on behalf of the Executive the following resolution:—

That this Special Emergency Conference of the Labour Party reaffirms the demand of the Inter-

(Continued on page 1129.)

THE NEW GERMANY.

"We are ready to come to the help of the German Proletariat with bread and arms and Revolutionary experience" (*Pravda*, organ of Russian Socialists, October 17th, 1918).

The German Revolution, closely following upon that of Austria and Bulgaria, has ended the most sanguinary and disastrous war of all history, that lasted more than four years and three months, during which some 15 millions of men must have perished in battle, either from wounds or from disease, and millions more of non-combatants from famine, starvation and the plague which dog the footsteps of war.

Hail to the German Socialist Revolution!

Hail to the Workers' and Soldiers' Councils!

The Revolution in Germany is the fitting commemoration of the anniversary of the Russian Soviet Republic. On November 5th, 1917, Trotski, President of the Petrograd Council of Workers' and Soldiers' Delegates requested the Petrograd garrison not to obey military orders unless approved by the Maximalist Military Committee: three days after the Bolsheviki assumed power, Kerenski having fled.

On November 6th, 1918, the German Fleet revolted at Kiel, the soldiers refusing to obey the order of their officers to go out to action. Within a few hours the Sailors' Councils controlled the harbour and were working in close touch with those of the Soldiers and Workmen in the town, where a general strike was proclaimed. Within two days Wilhelmshaven, Cuxhaven, Rostock, Bremen, Lübeck and Hamburg had followed Kiel's lead. On November 9th a general strike was proclaimed in Berlin, organised by the Workmen and Soldiers' Council. The barracks and factories emptied; the soldiers removed their epaulets, reversed their helmets, disarmed the officers, tore off from them the Iron Cross, and joined the people. A procession was formed that marched through the town to take possession of public buildings and military establishments. From the balcony of the Reichstag, Scheidemann informed the eagerly-expectant multitude that the Kaiser and the Crown Prince had abdicated, and a Government had been formed with Ebert as Chancellor. On Sunday this decision was approved by the Berlin Soviet, formed by the amalgamation of the Majority and Minority Socialists.

THE RED FLAG FLIES OVER THE EX-KAISER'S PALACE.

Besides the Hohenzollern and the Hapsburg, twenty-three minor dynasties have been swept away and a hord of princelets, of dukelets, court officers and generals is in flight or in hiding.

The Berlin Soviet has taken over the *Norddeutche Allgemeine Zeitung*, which now appears as the *Internationale* and the *Berliner Localanzeiger* as the *Red Flag*. In Frankfurt, Chemnitz, Leipsig, Cassel, Nuremberg, Münster, Essen and other important towns, Soviets have been set up. Herr Krupp and his wife have been made prisoners. All the national cockades and eagles have been removed and have been replaced by a red band. Councils of Soldiers are strictly guarding the frontiers of Germany in order to prevent rich people, generals and high officers escaping. The Kaiser, who, it is said, had decided to give himself up to the English, but was prevented by the Revolutionary soldiers is an unwelcome guest in Holland, where, at the time of writing, a Republic is in question.

Meanwhile events in Berlin have been repeated throughout Germany. The establishment of a Bavarian Republic is confirmed. The Diet dissolved and Kurt Eisner is at the head of the new Government, taking office a few hours after leaving his prison.

Political prisoners have been set free everywhere: Rosa Luxemburg being liberated on November 8th. Joffe, the Russian people's Ambassador, who, in the last days of the old regime had been expelled, has returned to Berlin. On the other hand, all the members of the German Delegation in Petrograd, being representative of the defunct Society, have been imprisoned.

All information to hand points to the successful establishment of a German Republican Socialist Confederation, to which German Austria has already expressed its desire to adhere; based on the "Soviets" principle of working-class representation. It will have the full assistance of Soviet Russia, which declares through its Central Executive Committee: "We will in this struggle support the German workers with all our strength and all possible means, by the organisation of the Red Army, with a view to international development; with the creation of a food-reserve for the Austrian and German workers in this struggle against internal and external robbers and criminals." In fact, it is reported via Stockholm, a Red Army of a million men is being organised.

In Germany, the position of parties appears to be the following:—

The German Social Democratic Party is divided into "Majority" (with Scheidemann as leader), and "Minority" (Independent, under the leadership of Kautsky); and both parties seem apparently losing ground already, because many of the "Independents" have now gone to swell the ranks of the "Communist" Party (with Rühle and Dittmann, the hero of a naval mutiny of months ago, as leaders, and with the *Bremer Arbeiterpolitik* as their press organ). The Liebknecht, or "Spartacus" Group, or Extreme left.

They have opposed the war from the first, and it has been very active during the last few days. Already, on October 28th, a few days after his release from prison, Liebknecht, commemorating the 40th anniversary of the passing of the Bismarckian laws for suppressing Socialism, that lasted twelve years and failed, had spoken at five meetings in Berlin, and demanded the establishment of a Socialist Republic. The name of "Spartacus," is taken from that of the monthly organ, called after the leader of the Gladiatorial War against the imperial power of Rome, a Thracian by birth, who, at the head of 70,000 plebs and slaves, defeated in 73-71 B.C., army after army of Roman soldiers.

Finally, moulded by recent events, with the sufferings and the injustices of the War vividly in their minds the Masses organised the Soldiers' and Workers' Council.

To the question of frontiers, arising out of the terms of the armistice with the Allies, the Liebknecht group attaches but little importance, saying: "The national question has no significance if we succeed in bringing about Socialism. And succeed we will: for already, before the War, one-third of the German people followed the red flag. The economic pre-requisites for Socialism are more complete in Germany than in any other country. The decisive battles between Capital and Labour will be fought on German soil, and at no distant period of time."

With regard to the question of peace on Wilson's 14 points, they are equally outspoken. The *Folkets Dagblad Politiken* of Stockholm, that, owing to the German re-action, has in the past voiced abroad Liebknecht's voice, says:—

"Wilson is no democrat, as it is proved by his attitude to the Russian peasant revolution.... The Anglo-French-American expedition against the Russian Socialists is on a par in brutality with the German interference in Revolutionary Finland—worse even than the invasion of Belgium, for the latter was a capitalist and reactionary state, whereas Russia is revolutionary and Socialist. The mantle of the Kaiser has fallen upon President Wilson. He has never protested when the Socialist Duma factions were sent to Siberia because they wanted peace. Wilson was silent when whole regiments of French were shot; he did not protest against the White Terror in Finland bringing death to thousands of workmen, and calling the Germans into the land, setting aside all constitutional laws and guarantees. The American capitalism is as inhuman as Prussian feudalism....In America the right to strike is denied, papers that speak against the War are forbidden; priests or professors with pacifist leanings are dismissed; Socialists on the side of peace are lynched or imprisoned....Freedom for the workers is withheld, in speech and in print."

In another issue the same paper says: "It is hardly believable that Rockefeller & Co. had pushed the 'Dollar Kaiser' into a war for the purpose of redeeming mankind."

The Germans are a highly educated, orderly and disciplined people. Already in the proclamation of November 8th one hears the true voice: "The German people has won the greater victory, for it has conquered itself."

The French Socialists are fully aware of the danger that the military forces of the Allies might be used to crush the noble work of the German people. In *Humanité* Deputy Paul Mistral writes: "That to-morrow, after the armistice, a new war shall begin: the war of the international counter-revolution, the crusade against all peoples on the high road of their political and economic freedom: that is possible; but strange surprises are in store for those who shall begin any such adventure." Deputy Cachin, the editor of same paper: "Our soldiers, our peasants, our French workers will never allow that expeditions 'to re-establish order' shall take place against the peoples that have fought for the freedom of the working-class."

It is therefore imperative that British Labour, whether officially or unofficially it does not matter much, provided the thing is done, should speak with a clear voice: Fraternal greetings to the German Socialist Republic. No political or economic intervention!

S.

LABOUR PARTY CONFERENCE
Concluded.

Allied Conferences of February and September, 1918:—

(1) That, in the official delegations from each of the belligerent countries which formulate the Peace Treaty, the workers should have direct official representation.

(2) That a World Labour Congress should be held at the same time and place as the Peace Conference that will formulate the Peace Treaty closing the war.

(3) That this Conference demands that the Government should afford facilities for the fulfilment of the above proposals.

MacDonald recalled Lloyd George's promise in 1916 that if the Labour Party joined the Coalition, it should be officially represented at the Peace Conference. Lloyd George had then said that he hoped Labour would be at the Peace Conference, as we wanted this to be the last war, and nothing would conduce more towards a satisfactory peace than the presence of Labour representatives. Therefore, MacDonald was amazed at the statement that Labour, as an independent factor in the House of Commons, should not be represented.

The holding of Labour's own Peace Conference was, in MacDonald's view, more important than securing a representative at the official Peace Conference. But he carefully disclaimed the idea that Labour should seek to point a pistol at the Government, or to claim any special rights not extended to the churches, the women's organisations, or any others. He protested: "We say to the Governments, you have your special responsibilities; we don't want to touch them at all; Governments must act as governments." He explained that trade, tariffs, and so on, would be dealt with by the Peace Conference, and whilst in the negotiations the capitalists would regard the world as a huge market, Labour's voice must be heard because it would regard the world as a huge workshop. No, no, Mr. MacDonald, you are wrong there: Labour ceases to think of the world as a workshop where the best of its waking hours are to be employed; Labour demands that the world shall be a place in which the masses, not the privileged few alone, shall live and shall enjoy life; Labour no longer demands the right to work, but the right to play.

Smillie seconded the resolution, chiefly, he said, in order to announce that the French Socialists and Trade Unionists had met to congratulate the German workers on establishing their republic and to elect Liebknecht and other German Socialists as honorary presidents of their association. This British Labour Conference, he said, had not the courage to pass a similar resolution. This Conference failed to realise both its own power and the intense feeling in the industrial centres. If it did realise these things, it would say that unless Labour were given at least half the representatives at the official Peace Conference and allowed to meet in its own International, Labour would take immediate steps to enforce that demand. Labour on the Continent was giving us an amazing lesson. It was doing more things for itself in one year than we had got from capitalist Governments in twenty or twenty-five years.

Of course, the resolution was carried without dissent. The Conference closed with a speech from Sydney Webb on reconstruction, which no one heard or attempted to listen to.

The play was over; we were all putting on our hats and coats to go; many were wondering whether, now that the Labour men had been ordered out of the Government, it had been worth the trouble of coming here to do it, and how soon the Parliamentary game would altogether end.

E. SYLVIA PANKHURST.

ORIGINAL DEFECTIVE.

CAPITALISM AND THE COUNTER REVOLUTION.

By J. T. WALTON NEWBOLD

IV.

In the last article I pointed out how the Socialist Movement of this country and of America could be shown to have grown up as a consequence of certain material factors in the development of the capitalist system. The periods of its growth were three. The first was that of the "eighties," the second lasted from 1903 to 1909-10, and the third synchronised with the war. On all three occasions, and in both countries, its expansion was the result of the discontent of those who most severely felt the pressure of dilution, and who did not, at the same time, feel any confidence in imperialism or improvement within the existing economic and political order. The Socialist Movement is essentially middle class in its leadership and outlook, because—oh, irony of ironies!—the idealists who so largely compose it are impelled by the hard material facts of their social environment. The working class, as a class, seems to be benefitting very greatly from the activities of syndicated capitalism and of imperialism. It is being kept continuously employed and fed with its own tail, as well as with the surplus and a considerable part of the capital, or accumulated past surpluses, of the rest of the middle class. This, of course, is most distressing to the members of the middle class, and some of them are virtuously and indignantly convinced that it is a most immoral procedure thus to relieve them of stolen property. Perhaps it is, but it is not the kind of felony that should cause Socialists to cry "Stop thief!"

The working class—the proletariat—has been created by means of a continuous process of wearing away the past property of its present members. It is the product of developing and developed Capitalism—as well, of course, as of "Primitive Accumulation." Whenever the wearing process takes place on a considerable scale "unrest" becomes visible. Sometimes it is seen as Radicalism, as Chartism, as "Rebecca," even as Fabianism. It is the workers, and others, who are dispossessed and degraded from their former rights and customs, whose blind eyes are opened to behold visions and who dream dreams. They nurse their old wrongs. They are slow to develop new sympathies. So, the Irish may make good rebels against the oppressors of Ireland, but they have seldom been a source of strength to the Labour Movement into which they have been injected. Many agricultural workers, indeed, have done so much better—or so it seemed to them—in industry than on the land; that they have been bulwarks of reaction from the first. It was the diluting elements in industry whose demand for cheap corn ruined Chartism almost from the first. A great blow to the status of some section of the workers may produce a state of unrest such as the late D. A. Thomas engendered in the Rhondda. But a speedy recovery of wages owing to expanding trade has blotted out all apparent—though not all actual—memory of the crisis, as was bound to be the case where the workers had had a long continued experience of a poor standard of life and freedom. As often as the capitalist system can absorb the elements which it unsettles and degrades and can give to these an apparent freedom and status equal to that which they have immediately lost, it will not be threatened by the ever-increasing army of the working class. Hitherto it has been in a position to do this—if not at once, then before any great length of time has elapsed.

For three-quarters of a century British Capitalism has required to find an ever-widening outlet for its surplus of products, and it has only been able to keep its workers in remunerative employment when it could unload advantageously on the world market what these workers could not buy back for themselves. This it accomplished successfully until about a generation ago, when the products of short or long date British loans began to come home in too great abundance. This disturbance could be represented as the work of the wicked foreigner. The mystery was hidden, or deliberately concealed, from the workers' wondering gaze. The State, amazing metamorphosis of the corporate propertied class, came forward and "made" work—building battleships. It could not tax the workers—unless it dressed them better so as the better to "pluck" them—so it had to "skin" the rest of the middle class. So—to mix the metaphors—the bourgeois dogs have been eating dog for the last generation.

Apart from the killing and maiming process, the war has been, like the years preceding it, a most favourable time for the working class. If one industry shut down another was ready to absorb the workers in ever-increasing hordes. Capitalism has discovered the magic wand enabling it to sell commodities faster than they were produced, and to keep on doing it. The means of payment have been ideal, for everything has been abundant—except necessities and luxuries—including "the rare and refreshing fruit." Capitalism has had to borrow in order to lend to the workers—who could not eat shells. But the workers fondly imagine that they have been paid for services rendered. The situation is going to be delightful when these loans come to be honoured.

But let us turn from this interesting prospect of the future, before we go too far, to examine another factor which is all too often overlooked and which has had much to do with causing the workers to remain content with this, the best of all (capitalist) worlds.

During the stormy years of social and political upheaval that followed the passing of the Reform Bill of 1832, the workers found that they had been used and then abandoned by their allies. The governing class and the would-be governing class of this country—*i.e.*, those who controlled the State, and those who, as yet, only controlled Parliament—also discovered that it was a great mistake to trust to the truncheon to keep the people quiet. Like Peel, when he reformed the Penal Code, they had learned the lesson of Liberalism, and they resolved to be kind only to be cruel. From several standpoints they began to chant: "Education," taking care that the people did not hear too often the remainder of the sentence: "is the best form of police." For thirty years the two parties in "society," the one in, and the other entering the State, quarrelled over the kind of education to be given to the workers. After the second Reform Bill the matter became urgent, and 1870 saw the advance of the capitalist Liberals, bearing the workers the grateful gift of the three Rs. When the workers became Socialistically inclined, they were rewarded with a system made both compulsory and free. When their C 3 physique showed them unfit for defending an A 1 Empire, the idealists were allowed to feed and medically inspect the children who would be wage workers.

Only those who have been through or carefully studied the "dope" factory of the elementary education system can realise that a 6*d.* share in it is worth even more than £14 10*s.* to the capitalist class.

The workers of Britain have been educated, unlike the hapless workers of Russia, to think with the thoughts of their masters. They have been taught enough to "write to John Bull about it" and to read Beaverbrook's *Daily Express*, and to work out the arithmetical calculations of the racing newspapers.

Their literature, their music, their geography, their history, their religious instruction, as taught in the schools, are soaked in capitalist ideology. Out of school, new agencies await to educate them. Grown to manhood they meet the "impartial" educationists of Owen's College, Firth College, Armstrong College, Lady Margaret's College, &c., coming to guide them in the ways where they will become factors for "industrial peace" and where they will learn to be "good citizens" of the State, which is fast becoming as much an engine of social, moral, and intellectual despotism as the Holy Catholic Church was at the close of the Feudal Age.

(*To be continued.*)

AN APPEAL TO THE YOUNG. By James Stewart.

IN THE WORKSHOP.

"*An injury to one is an injury to all.*"

Boys and girls, when you start to work, no matter what branch of industry you take up, be it in an office, or at a bench, in a shipyard, mine, factory, or shop, you must first recognise that having entered the industrial world to work you will receive wages in return for that work. Those wages will enable you to assist your parents to buy food, clothing, and shelter. The amount of the things you will be able to enjoy will be measured by what you can purchase with your wages. If you want better or more food, clothing, &c., you will have to get more wages. If you go to your employer and ask for an increase, he will probably tell you that you receive all he intends to give for the work you do, and if you are not satisfied you can leave his employment. You are in this position: in order to live decently and well you must have more wages; but the employer, because he owns the tools whereby you produce wealth, has the right to dispense with your services. He owns the means whereby you live, therefore he owns your life while you are working for him. Now, working side by side with you are other boys and girls, and also men and women, who are in the same position as you. Talk to them about your desire for more wages and you will find that that desire possesses them all. Keep talking about it; ask them what you can do and what they can do to get more wages. That is the first problem that will face you in the workshop. By perseverance you will find the Solution.

ORGANISATION.

A tangled web in sooth it is,
Yet here we have the clue:
The tools whereby the many live
Are mastered by a few.

You, as workers, are justified when you demand an increase of wages. But we desire to point out to you that if you make your demand for more wages as individuals you run a chance of getting discharged from your employment. If, on the other hand, all the boys and girls and men and women who work side by side with you, are prepared to make the same demand, the strength of your numbers will, at least, compel your masters to consider your demands. They know that whilst they can do without some of us, they cannot do without us all. Thus the first lesson you will learn in the workshop will be the value of organisation; the value of the workers getting together to make their demands for more wages or improved conditions.

BOLSHEVIK IDEALS (concluded from page 1127).

The truth is that they hated Germany much less than they hated capitalism. The military collapse and the Brest-Litovsk Treaty were Tsardom's death-bed gifts to the Russian people.

Our preoccupation with the War has made us more than usually stupid. Russians say that England, no less than Germany, desires to make Russia a tool of "imperialistic" policies. Certain it is that our dealings with Russia since the Revoluton have been limited and misdirected. We have thought of Russia only or chiefly as a possible agent in the War....

Copies of this Article in Pamphlet Form may be obtained from 152 Fleet Street. Price 2d.

WORKSHOP NOTES: By W. F. WATSON.

THE NEED FOR A SHOP STEWARDS CO-ORDINATING BODY FOR LONDON.

During our many visits to the provinces we have invariably been asked what London is doing with regard to industrially organising the workers, and when we reply that London is doing its best, we are told that that benighted city is simply hopeless. And sometimes we think it is. When we think of the splendid organisation of our provincial comrades, and when we consider that to organise similarly London Workers has always been the despair of those who have attempted it, we sometimes wonder whether it will ever be achieved; but we have by no means abandoned all hope. To my mind the mistake has been in not making due allowance for local circumstances and factors which appear to militate against the building up of a powerful movement.

It is too often thought that because a certain form of organisation is suited for the workers on the Clyde or any other big industrial centre, that form of organisation is equally suited for London workers. This is a fundamental error. It must be remembered that London is NOT an industrial centre; it is the seat of Commerce and Finance. London is also the seat of royalty and government, in consequence of which it has a large and, with the growth of bureaucracy, an ever increasing population of sycophants and lackeys who have vested interest in the perpetuation of Capitalism and the State. Again we must remember that London covers a very wide area and the great mass of the workers live miles from their work, and we don't blame them, with the result that, in spite of the travelling facilities, it is very difficult to get them together except under extraordinary circumstances. And, lastly, we must not forget the thousand and one occupations the London workers are engaged in, which necessitate different modes of organisation.

Nevertheless, four years of warfare have taught the London workers the value of workshop organisation, with the result that shops and workers' Committees are springing up everywhere.

All these Committees came into existence for the same reason—the failure of the ordinary trade union movement—and all have the same object—to secure more and more control in the workshop—but by reason of varying circumstances and trade conditions each takes a different form. There is, for instance, the Woolwich Arsenal S.S. Committee, which at present is a purely craft committee mainly confined to the A.S.E. This committee is extremely powerful in the Arsenal, and as a consequence many of its members think it the ideal form of organisation. Similarly with the River Thames Ship Repairers Committee and the London Woodworkers Council. Then there is the W. London Engineer Workers Committee, influential in the W. London area, the London Workers, &c., &c. It seems to me that these committees represent varying degrees of consciousness and what we have to do is to co-ordinate their activities without in any way interfering with the method of building up the local or trade committee.

It may be said that such a co-ordinating body will tend to become re-actionary because of those committees with a lesser degree of consciousness, but this can be safeguarded against by insisting that the basis of the co-ordinating body shall be consistent with the highest degree of consciousness. This has in fact been achieved. The conference of Shop Stewards and Workers' Committees which met at Chandos Hall on Saturday, October 19th, decided to accept the recommendation that a London and District Council of S.S. and Workers be formed, and it was further agreed that the basis of the Council shall be the organisation of the workers regardless of craft or sex, with the avowed object of securing control of the industries.

A further conference is to be held to draw up the few rules that will be necessary, to draft a constitution and to appoint necessary officers. The value of such a council will be apparent to all. Each co-ordinated committee will be free to develop its own organisation in its own way and each will appoint its delegates to the Council. If we ensure that the delegates directly represent the men and women in the shop, and if we have regular meetings, each committee will be cognisant of the stage of development of all other committees. Then, should trouble arise in any one section, or locality, the industrial forces of all can be quickly brought to bear upon the situation, thereby enhancing the possibilities of success. But that is only one of the advantages. By extending operations into every sphere of industry impetus will be given to the formation of more committees and by eliciting the active support of the discharged soldiers and sailors it may become the nucleus of the London Soldiers', Sailors' and Workmen's Council. There is no limit to its possibilities and potentialities, and we urge every shop steward and all committees to render service by making the Council as widely known as possible and by seeing to it that every committee is represented at the next conference. Further information may be had from 7, Featherstone Buildings, W.C.1.

A REAL WORKERS' MEETING.

As fully expected the politicians have so arranged things that a general election is to take place immediately, following the cessation of hostilities. It would never do to have the people united upon the declaration of peace, so they must be divided and nothing is calculated to divide the people more than a General Election. And, of course, an election necessitates numerous meetings of all factions and parties, including the Labour Party. I was at the Albert Hall on Thursday, November 14th, and was struck by the entire absence of workers amongst the speakers, by the poverty of ideas expressed and by the hostility to the Labour politicians on the part of a large element of the vast audience. The speakers were M.P.s, Trade Union officials, and middle-class people who, not being of the workers, can never, however good their intentions, give adequate expression to the desires and aspirations of the workers.

These people speak of "Labah" and the "Working Clarses" as though it was something quite apart from themselves, and as though it was some helpless infant that required a wet nurse. The two women speakers reminded one of nothing so much as Charity Organisation dames and the reference by one of them to a "tripe shop" was particularly unfortunate. We may not have the ability (if any is required) to run such a tripe shop as the Albert Hall meeting, but we have the ability and the moral courage to tell the workers the correct way to organise to enable them to achieve their emancipation even though those ideas are unpopular with the politicians.

The London Workers' Committee is somewhat "fed up" with these middle-class politicians whatever their particular label might be, and their references to "Labah" and the "Working Clarses", and, with a view to outlining a practical working policy, the members of the L.W.C. have decided to hold a mass meeting of WORKERS to be addressed by WORKERS. The meeting will take place on Sunday, December 1st, 6 P.M. The list of speakers and the hall will be announced in next week's DREADNOUGHT and other workers' papers. Some difficulty has been experienced in securing a suitable hall, and not having the financial resources of a huge Trade Union, or a big political party, and not being blessed (or cursed) with wealthy friends we crave forgiveness if we do not secure the Albert Hall. We appeal to the workers of London to bear the date, December 1st, in mind, and to roll up in their thousands to hear what the Workers' Committee Movement has to say about the problems and difficulties that immediately confront us.

PARLIAMENT AS WE SEE IT.

VICTORY.

On Monday, Nov. 11th, immediately after prayers, the Prime Minister rose and read the terms of the Armistice; Mr. Asquith said a few chosen and non-committal words, and, then, on the proposal of Mr. Speaker, the House adjourned at eighteen minutes past three and, with the Lords, proceeded to the Church of St. Margaret, Westminster, to attend a Service of Thanksgiving to Almighty God.

Napoleon, whose power, with the assistance of the Germans, we broke at Waterloo, used to say that "God is always on the side of the big battalions." He was a bit of a sceptic, old "Bony" was, and we do not hold with that saying. We earnestly joined in the prayer for Peace, specially since we cannot be guilty of the gross blasphemy of believing that the Almighty God would ordain, on the same day, the right thing on the left bank of the Rhine and the wrong one on the right bank of that fateful river. He had, therefore, we take it, "a finger in the pie" in setting up the German Federated Socialist Republic.

JOHN MACLEAN AND SOME MYSTERY.

Mr. Munro, in answer to Mr. King, says he did not see any advantage in receiving a deputation in Glasgow, urging on him that Maclean should be released. In answer to Mr. Whitehouse, whether he is still forcibly fed, and if it is proposed to release him: "I have nothing to add to replies already given," . . "except that as Maclean is now taking two meals a day in the ordinary way, he is artificially fed only once," a reply to our lay mind, rather puzzling, unless it is suggestive of very bad health. About 150 petitions, protests and resolutions against the continued imprisonment of John Maclean have reached the Secretary for Scotland.

DEMOBILISATION.

Personally, we do not believe it will happen as soon as many people think, but here you are: Lectures are already being given at the front dealing with the outlines of the procedure to be adopted. The claims of married men to early release have been recognised, and, conditions being equal, they will be selected in preference. In view of the shortage of coal, coal-miners are released from the Army in accordance with the decision of the War Cabinet: as many as possible. The question is also being considered of an early demobilisation of officers and soldiers of like standing whose education has been interrupted, provided that it can be proved that is the case.

DEATH PENALTY.

"The answer is in the negative," says the Under Secretary of State for War, to Mr. Trevelyan, who asked "whether, now that the armistice is signed, the death penalty will be abolished in the British Army."

RECRUITING.

"While recruiting under the Military Service Acts has been suspended," says Mr. Beck, "those Acts remain in force in case the necessity should arise for bringing them again into operation."

* * *

A man, whose exemption has expired, need not make application for renewal until public notice has been issued. He that holds a conditional exemption and ceases to fulfil the conditions may be called up for service, in the event of resumption of recruiting.

SOVIET GOVERNMENT.

Now that armistices with all the enemy States of Germany, the Dual Monarchy, Bulgaria, Turkey, have been concluded, Mr. King is eager to know whether the military expedition to Russia will be pressed on. Mr. Bonar Law diplomatically answers: "I can make no statement." Well, we could, but we can't, not in print anyhow. Mr. Balfour "understands" that the Maximalist authorities in Russia have "inquired whether a neutral Government would promote negotiations between them and the Allied Powers"; but, he too, cannot make any statement "as to the conditions under which our hostile operations in Russia may be concluded. "Mum," is the word, in other words, even for M.P.s. Therefore, if you really want to know something about the cessation of hostilities in Russia, at Archangel, on the Murman Coast, or the Black Sea you had better go down the Edgware Road and seek a palmist, a crystal-gazer or a thought-reader on that point, it will be just as good as Parliament.

WHAT'S A NATION? "DUNNO!"

Candid Bonar Law confesses ignorance. No definition has been reached defining the term "nation" as used in the fourteen points of President Wilson. Are the Yugo-Slavs a nation and the Irish and Scottish people not?

WORKERS' SOCIALIST FEDERATION.

LONDON MEETINGS.

OUT DOOR.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 22nd.
Castle Road, Kentish Town.—5.30 P.M., Miss Price.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 23rd.
Great Push for a People's Peace, Socialism and Votes for All in Hoxton.—Meet at Whitmore Head at 3 P.M. Speakers: Miss Price, Mrs. Walker, Mrs. Clara Cole, Mr. Moscovitch.

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 24th.
Osborn Street, Whitechapel.—11.30 A.M., Miss Price.
Finsbury Park.—3 P.M., John McLean Demonstration.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 26th.
Clocktower, Burdett Road.—11.30 A.M., Miss Price.

FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 29th.
Hague Street, Bethnal Green.—11.30 A.M., Miss Price.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 30th.
Great Push in Leytonstone.

INDOOR.

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 25th.
44, Malden Road.—2.30 P.M., St. Pancras W.S.F. Business Meeting.

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 28th.
29B, Lincoln's Inn Fields.—7.30 P.M., E. G. Smith
76, Whitechapel Road.—8 P.M., Rev. Ch. Wills. Chair: Mr. Moscovitch.

SUNDAY, DECEMBER 1st.
400, Old Ford Road.—7 P.M., Mrs. Rosa Hobhouse, Mr. G. A. K. Luhani (C.C.L.), 'Freedom.' Chair: Miss N. Smyth.

OTHER ORGANISATIONS.

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 26th.
Walthamstow League of Rights William Morris Hall, Somers Road.—2.30. P.M. Miss Horsfall

FEDERATION NOTES.

In spite of the fact that most people were mafficking in the Albert Hall or elsewhere on Thursday; we had a small audience in Chandos Hall, to hear Sylvia Pankhurst and David Ramsay, and though we froze, the speeches were worth freezing for. We should, however, advise all Socialists to equip themselves with a "winter warmer" for meetings. We were able to hand over 25s. 6d. profit to the General Fund. On Thursday, November 28th, E. G. Smith is the speaker at 29B, Lincoln's Inn Fields on 'Dear Brutus.' Come and hear a good lecture without freezing.

SHALL TOM MOONEY HANG?

A Monster Protest Meeting

will be held at

The ORPHEUM Cinematograph Theatre, Croydon

On SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 24th, 1918, at 7 p.m.

ADMISSION FREE. Collection.

Several well-known Speakers will be present, among them being JOHN MOONEY, brother of TOM MOONEY, Ex-Inspector SYME, W. F. WATSON, and other speakers.

TOM MOONEY, of the Moulders' Union of San Francisco, California, was sentenced to hang August 23rd, 1918, but owing to the intervention of Trades Unions in America, Great Britain, France and Italy, and also to the action of President Wilson, a reprieve until December 13th was granted. The Governor of the State of California has signified his intention of refusing a further reprieve or a pardon. Strong effort is therefore necessary at once in order to save Mooney's life.

TRADE UNIONISTS, COME IN YOUR THOUSANDS.

ANTIQUES.

Highest Prices given for Old China or Antique Furniture in any condition,

MARY CASEY,

29b Lincoln's Inn Fields, W.C.2.

LEANEY'S LTD.,

WHOLESALE NEWSAGENTS.

City Agent for the Workers' Dreadnought

9 and 10, ST. BRIDE'S AVENUE, E.C.4.

(Late City and Suburban Publishing Co.)

MISCELLANEOUS ADVERTISEMENTS

FAMILY LIMITATION DOCTRINE. Post free, 1½d.—Malthusian League, 48, Broadway, Westminster.

To Dreadnought Readers in the Borough of Croydon.

Do you know Croydon's own Socialist Weekly Newspaper?

THE EPISTLE (estab. 1916).

The Editor, Contributors, Publishers and Printers are all Socialists.

Price 1d. weekly, delivered anywhere in Croydon.

Send post card 112, Woodville Road, Thornton Heath.

FOR SCRAMBLED EGGS, ETC., USE

Greer's

Agreeable Whole Dried Eggs,

2 whole eggs 2½d.

D. W. GREER & Co., Camberwell, London, S.E.5.

GREAT DEMONSTRATION,

FINSBURY PARK.

Sunday, November 24th, at 3 p.m.

To Demand the IMMEDIATE RELEASE of JOHN McLEAN and all other POLITICAL PRISONERS.

Liebknecht and Adler are free, why not our Political Prisoners?

John Arnall, I.L.P.; T. A. Bibby, Hackney T. & L.C.; W. Carter, N.U.R.; E. C. Fairchild, B.S.P.; V. L. McEntee, B.S.P.; Alex Gossip, N.A.F.T.A.; Jack Mills, A.S.E.; Miriam Price, W.S.F.; H. G. Russell, N.C.F.; Councillor J. J. Vaughan; W. F. Watson, L.W.C.; A. A. Watts, B.S.P.; Mrs. Walker, W.S.F.; J. Andrews, B.S.P.

Comrades willing to distribute Bills at Albert Hall should meet E. C. Taylor outside main entrance on Saturday, at 5.45.

Funds urgently needed. Send a donation to G. A. Pargiter, Hon. Treasurer, 38 Florence Road, Southall, Middlesex.

Vote for The Children's Birthright

7 shillings a week to every child in our midst, as proudly welcomed citizens till they reach the age of 21 years, when they will be able to vote for themselves.

WORKERS' SOCIALIST FEDERATION

Thursday, December 5th, 3 to 10 p.m.

Opener - Mrs. CEDAR PAUL.

Chair - Mrs. DRAKE.

Boys from the London College of Choristers will sing.
Children's Dances. Pierrots.

Friday, December 6th, 2.30 to 10 p.m.

Opener - W. F. WATSON.

Chair - Miss PRICE.

Concert in aid of the Mothers' Arms Day Nursery. Children's Dances.

Saturday, December 7th, 2.30 to 10 p.m.

Opener - GEORGE LANSBURY.

Chair - Mrs. WALKER.

Concert—Madame Levinskaja, Madame Kontorovitch & other Artistes. Pierrots.

STALLS:

Curios - Mrs. CASEY. Vegetables and Fruit - Mrs. PASCOE.
Flowers - Miss CASEY. Remnants - Mrs. THRING.
Books, Literature, etc. - Miss HENRIETTA LESLIE.
Children's Garments - Miss BURGIS.
Garments & Christmas Tree - WALTHAMSTOW LEAGUE OF RIGHTS.
Toys - Mrs. ELLIS. Fancy Goods - Mrs. PEARCE.
Christmas Presents - Mrs. JEWSON. Grocery - Mrs. LAURITZEN.
Tobacco - "BOB" & "TANNER."
Refreshments - POPLAR BRANCH.
Psychic Delineators. Photographs While You Wait. Pearly King. Cockneys in Full Dress. Specially Attractive Side Shows.

Contributions towards the Stalls will be gratefully received by MRS. JEWSON, 54 St. Charles Square, N. Kensington, W., and should be sent by December 3rd, priced, if possible.

ADMISSION—2/6 (3 days), 2/- (2 days), 1/3 (1 day), 8d. after 6 p.m. (including Tax).

Apply early for Tickets to MISS BUSH, 400 Old Ford Road, E.3.

Printed by J. H. Francis, 11 and 13 Broams' Buildings, London, E.C.4, and Published by the Workers' Socialist Federation, at 152 Fleet Street, London, E.C.4.